



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,155	09/29/2000	Elizabeth Ann Murphy	19046.0001	3336

23517 7590 08/27/2002

SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP  
3000 K STREET, NW  
BOX IP  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SOTOMAYOR, JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/675,155

Applicant(s)

MURPHY ET AL.  
*Or*

Examiner

John L Sotomayor

Art Unit

3714

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- 4) Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)                    6) Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton (US 6,282,404) in view of Hollingsworth (US 6,157,808).
3. Regarding claims 1 and 20 Linton discloses a method and system of obtaining login data (Col 6, lines 20-24), providing compliance knowledge to a networked computer based upon the login (Col 6, lines 25-36), providing personalized professional training information based on the login data (Col 7, lines 35-37 and Col 10, lines 10-34), and generating compliance knowledge, personal training activity and tracking this information (Col 10, lines 10-62). Linton does not specifically disclose that the compliance knowledge is for a business professional role or the mechanism for determining such information. However, Hollingsworth teaches that in an interactive certification and training system a primary function is to identify licensing compliance information for all employees, and that such information is related to each employee's business professional role within the company (Col 3, lines 33-40). For an interactive training system and method to be most useful, the information must be stored in a database on a per employee basis, just as password and login information is stored. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a

system and method that stored business professional role information for each individual employee in a database and linked such information to individual employee accounts such that the compliance information could be retrieved upon login.

4. Regarding claims 2 and 21, Linton discloses a system in which training progress and activity data are generated and stored on the database server (Col 10, lines 10-34).

5. Regarding claims 3 and 22, Linton discloses a system and method wherein compliance knowledge, training progress and training performance data are all stored on an individual login basis (Col 3, lines 28-42).

6. In regard to claims 4 and 23, Linton discloses that all data generated and received by the system is stored on a database server (Col 9, lines 9-10).

7. In regard to claims 5 and 24, Linton discloses a system and method that generates documents such as administrative reports from database records that contain compliance knowledge, training progress and training performance data (Col 9, lines 37-40).

8. In regard to claims 6 and 25, Linton discloses a system and method that generates administrative reports in accordance with administrator instructions (Col 9, lines 40-51).

9. In regard to claims 7 and 26, Linton discloses that generated documents are stored on a database server in accordance with administrative instructions (Col 9, lines 66-67). Linton does not specifically disclose that this is a first set of administrative instructions. However, Hollingsworth teaches a process for determining the training needs of employees on an ongoing basis, which shows that there is a first set of administrative instructions as well as a number of subsequent administrative instructions that require document storage on the server (Col 3, lines 15-32). The generation of documentation relating to employee performance and training goals

established and met is an established, ongoing process in both prior inventions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a method and system for storing documents on the server in response to the first set, as well as subsequent sets, of administrative instructions.

10. In regard to claims 8 and 27, Linton discloses that the generated documents are stored on a database server (Col 9, lines 66-67).

11. In regard to claims 9-11 and 28-30, Linton discloses that the system and method manages several types of knowledge, links these knowledge areas to one another, and includes descriptive text as an integral feature of the knowledge areas (Col 7, lines 18-58).

12. In regard to claims 12-13 and 31-32, Linton discloses that the system and method manages a plurality of knowledge types containing, embedded within, links to other data across the network (Col 7, lines 50-58).

13. In regard to claim 14 and 33, Linton discloses a system and method that enables communication between one or more users (Col 10, lines 35-46).

14. In regard to claim 15 and 34, Linton discloses a system and method that provides reference compliance knowledge based upon a login (Col 8, lines 65-66).

15. In regard to claims 16-19 and 35-38, Linton discloses a system and method for administering and tracking compliance knowledge data based upon individual login accounts, the creation and tracking of user profile information, providing notification for compliance of users, and distributing this information to qualified administrators (Col 10, lines 2-62).

16. In regard to claim 39, Linton discloses a computer system and server coupled to the network for obtaining login data (Col 5, lines 35-65), providing compliance knowledge to a

Art Unit: 3714

networked computer based upon the login (Col 6, lines 25-36), providing personalized professional training information based on the login data (Col 7, lines 35-37 and Col 10, lines 10-34), and generating compliance knowledge, personal training activity and tracking this information (Col 10, lines 10-62). Linton does not specifically disclose that the compliance knowledge is for a business professional role or the mechanism for determining such information. However, Hollingsworth teaches that in an interactive certification and training system a primary function is to identify licensing compliance information for all employees, and that such information is related to each employee's business professional role within the company (Col 3, lines 33-40). For an interactive training system and method to be most useful, the information must be stored in a database on a per employee basis, just as password and login information is stored. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a system that stored business professional role information for each individual employee in a database and linked such information to individual employee accounts such that the compliance information could be retrieved upon login.

17. In regard to claim 40, Linton discloses that training progress and activity data are generated and stored on the database server (Col 10, lines 10-34).

18. In regard to claim 41, Linton discloses a server wherein compliance knowledge, training progress and training performance data are all stored on an individual login basis (Col 6, lines 21-36).

19. In regard to claim 42, Linton discloses that all data generated and received by the system is stored on a database server coupled to the network (Col 9, lines 9-10).

Art Unit: 3714

20. In regard to claim 43, Linton discloses a system and method that generates administrative reports that contain compliance knowledge, training progress and training performance data (Col 9, lines 37-65).

21. In regard to claim 44, Linton discloses that generated documents are stored on a database server in accordance with administrative instructions (Col 9, lines 66-67). Linton does not specifically disclose that this is a first set of administrative instructions. However, Hollingsworth teaches a process for determining the training needs of employees on an ongoing basis, which shows that there is a first set of administrative instructions as well as a number of subsequent administrative instructions that require document storage on the server (Col 3, lines 15-32). The generation of documentation relating to employee performance and training goals established and met is an established, ongoing process in both prior inventions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a method and system for storing documents on the server in response to the first set, as well as subsequent sets, of administrative instructions.

22. In regard to claim 45, Linton discloses that the generated documents are stored and updated on a database server (Col 9, lines 37-40 and Col 11, lines 1-12).

23. In regard to claim 46, Linton discloses a computer system for providing administration instructions (Col 10, lines 35-62)

24. In regard to claims 47-48, Linton discloses that the system manages several types of knowledge, links these knowledge areas to one another, and includes descriptive text as an integral feature of the knowledge areas (Col 7, lines 18-58).

25. In regard to claims 49-50, Linton discloses that the system manages a plurality of knowledge types containing, embedded within, links to other data across the network (Col 7, lines 50-58).
26. In regard to claim 51, Linton discloses a computer system with communication links stored within stored professional training information (Col 7, lines 44-58).
27. In regard to claim 52, Linton discloses a computer system that enables communication between one or more users (Col 10, lines 35-46).
28. In regard to claim 53, Linton discloses a computer system that provides reference compliance knowledge based upon a login (Col 8, lines 65-66).
29. In regard to claims 54-57, Linton discloses a computer system for administering and tracking compliance knowledge data based upon individual login accounts, the creation and tracking of user profile information, providing notification for compliance of users, and distributing this information to qualified administrators (Col 10, lines 2-62).
30. In regard to claims 58, 64 and 68, Linton discloses the use of compliance knowledge for employees (Col 3, lines 29-42). Linton does not specifically disclose the generation of compliance knowledge use data. However, Hollingsworth teaches that information concerning the use of compliance knowledge can be generated as part of an ongoing process of employee training evaluation (Col 3, lines 48-55). Information concerning how compliance knowledge is used closes the feedback loop on the training compliance process and provides a method for making the process more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a means to generate information concerning the use of compliance knowledge.

31. In regard to claims 59, 65 and 69, Linton discloses the use of compliance knowledge for employees in association with the login for each employee (Col 3, lines 29-42, Col 7, lines 18-29). Linton does not specifically disclose the generation of such compliance knowledge use data. However, Hollingsworth teaches that information concerning the use of compliance knowledge can be generated and stored on the server as part of an ongoing process of employee training evaluation on a per employee basis (Col 3, lines 48-59). Information concerning how compliance knowledge is used closes the feedback loop on the training compliance process and provides a method for making the process more efficient and thus should be associated on a per employee basis through the use of login profiles. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a means to generate information concerning the use of compliance knowledge associated with each employee through a login process.

32. In regard to claims 60, 65 and 70, Linton discloses the use of compliance knowledge for employees in association with the login for each employee (Col 3, lines 29-42). Linton does not specifically disclose the generation of such compliance knowledge use data or the storage of such data in a data repository. However, Hollingsworth teaches that information concerning the use of compliance knowledge can be generated and stored on the server as part of an ongoing process of employee training evaluation (Col 3, lines 48-59). Information concerning how compliance knowledge is used closes the feedback loop on the training compliance process and provides a method for making the process more efficient and thus should be stored for later perusal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to provide a means to generate information concerning the use of compliance knowledge and to store such information on the server.

33. In regard to claims 61-62, 66-67 and 71-72, Linton discloses the use of compliance knowledge for employees and the generation of reports containing this information (Col 7, lines 35-40). Linton does not specifically disclose the generation of such compliance knowledge use data or the generation of reports containing this information. However, Hollingsworth teaches that information concerning the use of compliance knowledge can be generated and stored on the server and later provided in reports to management (Col 3, lines 33-59). Information concerning how compliance knowledge is used closes the feedback loop on the training compliance process and provides a method for making the process more efficient and thus should be reported to management on an ongoing, periodically updated basis. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide a means to generate information concerning the use of compliance knowledge and to generate reports for management containing this information on an ongoing, periodically updated basis.

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

George et al (US Patent 5,978,648) discusses a networked training system that utilizes login data to provide targeted information to users of the system.

Shoham (US Patent 5,855,015) discusses a system and method of retrieval for hyperlinked training information and the management of training systems across the web.

Walton (US Patent 6,073,841) discusses a system for tracking and management of continuing education data for educational users.

Maloney et al (US Patent 5,696,811) discusses a method and system for providing performance and training feedback information for call center agents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John L Sotomayor whose telephone number is 703-305-4558. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on 703-308-2217. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7768 for regular communications and 703-308-7768 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4558.

jls  
August 20, 2002

1 - 2 - 73P  
Joe H. Cheng  
Primary Examiner